

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE A
RESPONSE TO THE CITY COUNCIL ADDRESSING CONCERNS RAISED IN THE
LEGAL ANALYSIS AND OPINION RELATING TO THE ROYAL LINKS GOLF
COURSE PREPARED BY SENN MEULEMANS, LLP, INCLUDING, BUT NOT
LIMITED TO DEVELOPMENT OF A BEST PRACTICES POLICY ADDRESSING
PUBLIC PURPOSE DOCTRINE, FULL COMMUNICATION ISSUES,
WHISTLEBLOWER RULES, AND CENTRALIZATION OF INFORMATION AND
OTHER MATTERS RELATING THERETO**

Appearance List:

OSCAR GOODMAN, Mayor
LOIS TARKANIAN, Councilwoman
GARY REESE, Councilman
STEVE WOLFSON, Councilman
LARRY BROWN, Councilman
GEORGE CHANOS, Attorney General

(00:00:03 – 00:29:48)

Typed by: Vicky Darling/Angela Crolli

Proofed by: Stacey Campbell

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

22 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

23 So, we'll move onto Item 62a. Item 62a is discussion and possible action to direct staff to
24 prepare a response to the City Council addressing concerns raised in the legal analysis and
25 opinion relating to the Royal Links Golf Course prepared by Senn Meulemans, LLP, including,
26 but not limited to, development of a Best Practices Policy addressing public purpose doctrine,
27 full communication issues, whistleblower rules, and centralization of information and other
28 matters relating thereto.

29 I asked that this matter be placed on the agenda, having received the report that was prepared by
30 the Attorney General's office through their legal counsel. And having reviewed that report,
31 having met with Attorney General Chanos, and had a discussion with him as to how the City is
32 going to react to the report.

33 And speaking to my colleagues, without forming any consensus, but getting the gist of the feeling
34 that this is an opportunity for the City of Las Vegas to make us a better place to be and make City
35 government act and be more efficient, be more responsive and be more effective than we have
36 been in the past. So I take the report as being the spark of constructive criticism and giving us a
37 reason to be introspective, to look at our own practices and procedures and, at the end of the day,
38 become a better place, as government should be.

39 I believe that the City of Las Vegas prides itself on our transparency as a government. We
40 criticize ourselves constructively in an open fashion, an open forum, where the public is able to
41 see how the inner workings of the City take place. And I think that's healthy for government. I
42 think that the public should know what their elected representatives are doing and how the City is
43 performing its – functions as a governmental entity.

44 We have issues that will be addressed. They're not going to be addressed today because the
45 report is a lengthy report and this is going to be the start of looking at how we do business in City
46 Hall. There are issues of communication which have to be resolved. There, as recently as this
47 morning, the Mayor Pro Tem and myself were going over an agenda item and we – found that the
48 – briefings were inconsistent. That what he had been told yesterday was one thing, what I was
49 told yesterday was another thing. And that's how problems can arise. So one of the things that
50 I'm going to be asking the Manger's office to look into is a line of authority. That when there's a
51 briefing the briefing be given by one person and the message be a consistent message so there're

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

not the – possibility that there would be a misunderstanding and that we would be like two ships in the night crossing ourselves, even with good intentions, based on the briefings that we get from the staff. And that should go from the Manager's office all the way down to any member of the staff who does brief us. The briefer should be the same person and the message should be the same message.

We have to talk about the public purpose doctrine. I'm not sure that there's a consensus as to what it really means. I've asked the Attorney General to be our guest today and perhaps he'll touch upon his view of the public purpose doctrine, but there appears to be some disagreement as to how broad the public purpose doctrine is. Just as an example, do we as a City worry about what happens in the surrounding areas because of our regional concerns and spend taxpayer dollars in order to resolve those issues or are we going to be limited to those that, matters that happened within the parameters or the confines of the City itself. I really want to know what the public doctrine, public purpose doctrine really is and I want it done with some definition and some certainty, so we know how we're going to be proceeding in the future.

I think we have to look into the role of the liaison. Sometimes I get the feeling that the liaison takes the place of the Councilperson in dealing with the staff and the staff really is responsible to the Councilperson and the Councilperson should talk directly to the staff. And because we do have a Manager's form of government, that message should be conveyed so that the Manager's office is involved in that process and that there not be a leapfrog from the 10th floor down to the ad ministerial positions within the City government.

We have to look at how do we treat a whistleblower. The whistleblower is certainly entitled to protection. Whistleblowers serve a purpose. If there's an irregularity, they bring it to the attention of the electeds and to – the media and, which is conveying to the public. But at the same time we have to look at how do we protect the person against whom the whistle is blown, because reputations can be severely maligned. And that's all we have in life, is our good name and our reputation and we have to look at a policy as to how a whistle blowing situation could take place. And equal importance, from my perspective, because if, and we're not getting into the Royal Links today, we're not getting into the particulars. But that particular situation lasted over a decade. And we had two mayors, myself being one. We had three city managers. We had, oh maybe, 15, 20 different council people during this – period of time. And there was no

Page 3 of 16

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

82 repository for the institutional knowledge that we could call upon, or at least if there was one it
83 was not made available to us. So we have to figure out a way that a Council five years from now
84 will know why we made the decision that we made, what information was given to us at that
85 time.

86 And I – think that these are areas that make us a better place. I – have no problem with a report
87 such as that which was returned. It was critical of us, and perhaps rightfully so. But at the same
88 time, we learn from it and – that’s the lesson and we’re going to be a better place as a result of it.

89 So with that, I’m going to ask the Council members to perhaps, to – chime in at this point and
90 then I’ll ask the Attorney General to come up. Because I want to hear from the Attorney General,
91 in particular regarding some criticism that the – City has received concerning our redevelopment
92 efforts. And I don’t want, the Attorney General and myself talked about this and I think that
93 things are getting confused in the mush of a lot of what’s happening here. We, as a City are
94 trying to redevelopment, or redevelop our inner core. We’re trying to make it into a vibrant
95 place, part of a renaissance, and in order to do that we enter into TIF financing arrangements with
96 concerns like the World Market Center, which have placed the – City in the spotlight around the
97 world. With the Chelsea properties people, we talked to Cox Communication and perhaps make
98 life a little better for them. Give them a little sweeter situation so they’ll go into an area and
99 bring their employees into the area and thrive, so that the area will be able to benefit from them.
100 We need a grocery store in the Westside. We’re going to make concessions in order to get that.
101 We need a grocery store downtown. We’re going to make concessions to get that. That is not
102 what I believe is the subject of the public purpose doctrine and we’re not being criticized for that,
103 but I think that when I ask the Attorney General to – comment on that he’ll give us, at least, his
104 opinion and we’ll be able to go from there.

105 So, let’s hear from the Council members and then we’ll hear from you, Mr. Chanos.

106
107 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

108 Mr. Mayor?

109
110 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

111 Yes.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

112 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

113 I agree with what you said, so much of what you said. I think it's very important that we
114 consider all of that in what we're doing. As I've thought about this I had some other thoughts
115 also and if I could just briefly mention those.

116

117 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

118 Certainly.

119

120 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

121 I think that, as we look at what we're doing and what's happened, we better, we – need to realize
122 and accept that leadership starts at the top. And we as a Council, and I include myself, cannot
123 sidestep our responsibility in this situation. Staff takes their direction from us. Staff moves
124 according to how they feel we feel. The final responsibility is ours as elected officials. If we
125 believe in open, responsive government, then that belief should extend to the way the City of Las
126 Vegas as a bureaucratic system functions. But look at what happened to the City of Las Vegas
127 employees who had the professionalism and bravery to step forward and try to do their best in
128 their job for the citizens of our City.

129 I – dislike the term whistleblower, because I think that's a negative type of thing when you're
130 looking at the courage it takes for someone to step forward. And maybe what they're saying isn't
131 always accurate but at least a step forward and give what they feel might be of a benefit to the
132 City. It's important that our staff feel that they can be open, honest and professional in their
133 dealings with us as elected representatives. I don't know what's happened in the past, as I'm
134 sure most of the other Council people don't, as far as why we have individuals who would feel
135 they couldn't step forward and – speak with us about, and speak to us about some problems. But
136 it's our job to weed through the information on difficult and contentious items and to use our
137 discretion as elected Council members in making decisions. That is our burden, not the staff
138 member's.

139 And so what are we going to do about the information provided to us in this report I think is very
140 critical. First I hope we obtain a greater understanding of the public purpose doctrine, which
141 you've said yourself, Mayor, is a step we're going to be taking. Second, I think we need to take

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

142 more time to examine the history and the background material on some of the more controversial
143 or precedent setting applications that come before us as a Council. I think myself and other
144 members of the Council at times have mentioned why are we in such a hurry and can we obtain
145 this additional information. I think it's very critical that we use the due diligence and if it takes
146 longer, if it requires more work from all of us, then so be it. So, again, agreeing with what you
147 said, Mr. Mayor, taking what this report presents, accepting it and move on positively to make
148 any needed changes or corrections and if we take this, what has been a negative situation, and we
149 move positively and make the changes that can make us stronger, then that's our very positive
150 result.

151 I just wanted to add that. I've been thinking about it a long time.

152

153 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

154 Thank you, Councilwoman. Mayor Pro Tem.

155

156 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

157 Thank you. I did read the report. I'm going read it, I think, a little bit more and study it a little bit
158 more thoroughly. But, I really think that everyone must, everyone should feel that when they
159 bring a project or an item before the City, that they know they will receive the same information
160 as each other individual will. I don't think there should be any favoritism. And, I, again, I will
161 reiterate what the Mayor said, I think it's important that we all, each day, whether it's last week or
162 tomorrow or whatever, that we have a continual type person telling us and giving us the same
163 information at each briefing. I know that I – think sometimes staff tells us what they think we
164 wanna know, and I've always told them don't patronize me, let me know where we're at and what
165 we're doing. I think staff needs to make sure that they – do this for us. They're not doing us a
166 favor if they don't tell us the truth on what – we need to do. And, it's like I told them sometimes,
167 my life is your hands and I – depend upon those briefings to make my decisions. You know, we
168 have four or five, six books every Council meeting; they're about yeah thick, and, I think it's
169 really hard to read and digest everything that's in there. So, we do – depend upon our personal
170 staff, as well as the City staff.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

171 I know that we all want this to happen and – this – report to me is a stark reminder that we all
172 have to work hard to make sure that it does happen each and every time. So, Mayor, I –
173 appreciate the report. I just hope that we all learn from it.

174

175 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

176 Thank you. Councilman Wolfson.

177

178 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

179 Thank you. I too would like to echo many of the comments that my colleagues have met, made,
180 but I'd like to add a couple of things. I too, join with you, Councilwoman Tarkanian, on the issue
181 of the flow of information. You and I have spoken about this publicly, as well as privately. We
182 voiced concerns a year, a year and a half ago about the flow of information and who receives
183 what information and when. And I'll never forget the day, and I wanna use one example out of
184 the case at hand, and that is the night I received a telephone call from one of our local Review
185 Journal reporters. And this reporter called me on my cell phone and said, Councilwoman (sic),
186 do you have any comments about the Metro report. And I said, what Metro report? And he told
187 me that the Metro had just been released and this Review Journal reporter had the report from
188 Metro before I did. And he asked me, you know, how do you think, how do you feel about the
189 contents of this report and what it says. And he read a few things out of the report to me, over
190 my cell phone, and I'll never forget the feeling I had at that moment; I was very disturbed. And
191 that's what prompted me to reflect for about twelve hours and it caused me the very next morning
192 to call our City Attorney, I believe, and cause this matter be put back on the Council's agenda for
193 reconsideration.

194 What I'm talking about is the flow of information and who gets what information when and who
195 takes the responsibility to provide it to us, as Mayor Pro Tem Reese said so – well. We make the
196 decisions up here. We make these decisions based upon information that we get from staff and
197 others. So, I would ask you, Dr. Selby, and I know you will, to review our methods and manners
198 of receiving information.

199 The second topic I'd like to just throw out there is, I've been on the Council, I don't know, 28
200 months now, and almost every briefing I have, with very few exceptions, is my staff to meet by

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

201 myself. None of my colleagues are sitting on these briefings. Oh, once in a while I'll have a
202 briefing in Councilwoman Tarkanian and I or Councilman Brown, I think, and I will sit together
203 and have a joint briefing. But 99 percent of the briefings are by an Assistant City Attorney or
204 somebody from Leisure Services or whatever department you wanna use as an example. And I
205 don't know why we can't have, in some cases, what I will call, joint briefings, where everybody
206 on this dais sits in a – room and is briefed by staff.

207 Now, I understand there's the Open Meeting Law and there's concerns about that, but I don't think
208 that we'd be violating the Open Meeting Law, especially on a case like this that has a – ten-year
209 plus history. And this, these matters were complicated, there were a lot of issues involved and
210 it's hard to receive information in an hour briefing. And then the next day one of my colleagues
211 will get a briefing from another staff member. Now, we're talking about human beings that are
212 disseminating information and I don't care how hard you try, if you have different briefings from
213 different people, there's going to be a different message, if you will. So, I would like to explore
214 the idea of joint briefings, not on every matter, we don't need it on every matter, but on the big
215 matters. So, that's something, that Dr. Selby, that I'd like you to explore. Thank you very much.

216

217 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

218 All right. Councilman Brown.

219

220 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

221 (Inaudible)

222

223 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

224 All right. Fine. Mr. Chanos, thank you for joining us.

225

226 **GEORGE CHANOS**

227 Thank you, Mayor and Council members. I have a few prepared remarks and I'd be happy to take
228 any questions.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

229 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

230 Very good.

231

232 **GEORGE CHANOS**

233 On November second two thousand and five the City Council voted to lift the deed restriction on
234 the Royal Links Golf Course. At that time, the decision was subject to significant public
235 criticism. Councilwoman Tarkanian was the lone vote against the measure. On November 9,
236 Councilman Wolfson moved to reconsider the November second vote. On November 15, nine,
237 two thousand and five our office announced our intent to investigate the matter. On November
238 sixteen two thousand and five the City Council voted to rescind their prior action. Shortly
239 thereafter, our office commissioned the law firm of Senn Meulemans to conduct an inquiry into
240 the transaction.

241 Approximately ten months later, after reviewing over 18,000 pages of documents and
242 interviewing dozens of people, Senn Meulemans issued a highly detailed and comprehensive, a
243 hundred and fifty seven-page report. The report detailed what I have described as a decade of
244 indifference, incompetence and negligence and or intentional misconduct at City Hall with regard
245 to the City's dealings with Mr. Walters. The report also concluded that the City's November
246 second vote to lift the deed restriction violated the public purpose doctrine. Following the
247 publication of the report, Mr. Walters withdrew his proposal. At this point, our office is engaged
248 in an on-going investigation into issues of concern based by the Senn Meulemans' report. To that
249 end, I have personally met with Mayor Goodman, City Manager Doug Selby, and City Attorney
250 Brad Jerbic, all of whom have been extremely forthcoming and cooperative, and all of whom
251 have expressed a clear, and I believe, a sincere understanding of the need for radical
252 improvement in the policies, practices and procedures, with respect to the flow of information
253 and other matters at City Hall.

254 Mayor Goodman has, in my opinion, shown the kind of leadership required under these
255 circumstances by acknowledging that the report, as he described it, is a good thing, and by calling
256 for needed improvements in the way City Hall processes and communicates information.

257 Councilwoman Tarkanian has, in my opinion, by being the lone vote against this proposal, shown
258 courage, great instincts and an unwavering commitment to the public interest. Councilman

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

259 Wolfson, by bringing the matter back for reconsideration on November ninth, brought the City
260 Council back from the edge of what would have, what could have been an abyss.

261 City Attorney Brad Jerbic has, throughout our interaction with him, demonstrated an openness,
262 candor and commitment to improvement that has exceeded our expectations. And City Manager
263 Doug Selby has acknowledged the fact that serious mistakes were made and has publicly
264 indicated that if he knew on November second what he knows now, he would have not
265 recommended removing the deed restriction. All of these acknowledgments are important, as
266 important, if not more important than the criticism contained in the report. For the ultimate
267 public benefit that can be derived from the report, is its ability to inspire reform. And to me, it is
268 clear that this report has at least begun to do that. All that remains for public confidence to be
269 fully restored is for that inspiration to be transformed into tangible and sustained action. I hope
270 and trust that the City Council, armed with the information contained in that report, will insist
271 that necessary reforms do in fact occur.

272 While it is clearly important to point out failures in government, when and where they exist, it is
273 equally important to recognize and encourage success in government. It is, therefore, appropriate
274 to recognize the fact that the same report, which chronicles a decade of indefensible conduct,
275 with respect to this particular transaction, also provides examples of exemplary conduct.
276 Multiple memorandums from John Redlein reveal a gifted and committed public servant, an
277 excellent lawyer and a man whose sole motivation was to do the right thing. While one might
278 reasonably question his well-publicized briefing of Councilman Wolfson, one would be hard-
279 pressed to question his motives. To the extent that he made a mistake, there were many mistakes
280 that occurred with regard to this transaction. But you need to look at the full history of his
281 performance at this office, and from what I've seen, based on the memos that I've read, you have
282 a great lawyer in Mr. Redlein.

283 Multiple memorandums from Tom Green, similarly revealed an extremely bright, talented and
284 ethical public servant. City Attorney Brad Jerbic, although criticized, to some degree, by the
285 report, and responsible, to some degree, for certain failures, is recognized in the report as having
286 been responsible for demanding a reversal of one of the more egregious failures at City Hall
287 during the last decade; the attempted two point two million dollar Western Summit change order.
288 That action, together with his complete cooperation and genuine commitment to reform, causes

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

289 me to believe that the public interest is well served by Mr. Jerbic's continued service as City
290 Attorney.

291 Others deserving a positive – recognition include without limitation, Betsy Fretwell, Scott
292 Adams, Julie Quisenberry, David Mendenhall, Lori Wohletz and Wendy Ellis. This is by no
293 means a comprehensive list, but simply is by way of example, a way to indicate that you have
294 many, many people working at City Hall who deserve public, the public's respect and
295 appreciation.

296 In sum, the City of Las Vegas has hundreds of wonderfully talented, if not thousands, of
297 wonderfully talented and dedicated public servants working to serve the public interest and it
298 would be a mistake for the public to lose sight of that fact and instead focus solely on the
299 negatives of the report. At the same time, it would be a mistake not to fully contemplate and
300 thoughtfully consider the criticisms contained in the report. As a community, I believe that we
301 need to learn all that we can from this failed transaction and use those lessons to improve our
302 performance. In the end, those lessons will prove to be the greatest value that the City of Las
303 Vegas could ever possibly receive from this transaction.

304 I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

305

306 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

307 All right. Thank you, Mr. Chanos. Why don't you touch upon our redevelopment efforts and
308 how you perceive those as it pertains to the public purpose doctrine.

309

310 **GEORGE CHANOS**

311 Okay. First of all, the public purpose doctrine gives the City generally broad latitude for
312 economic development. You're elected by the public to engage in matters that affect the public
313 interest, including, but not limited to, economic development. And there's substantial case law
314 that says that you can sell property, transfer property or dispose of property for below market
315 value. The guiding principle is that the net effect of your transactions have to be a net benefit to
316 the public, as opposed to a net detriment to the public. So to the extent that you articulate a valid
317 public purpose for your actions, if, for example, and I haven't looked at any particulars with
318 regard to your grocery store proposal or your Cox Communication proposal, but hypothetically

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

319 for example, if you – were to say that we want to put a grocery store in a certain area because it
320 will revitalize that area, it will bring – new residents into that area, it will cause economic
321 development in that area. And if there's a – good faith belief that that is the true purpose of the
322 action and that the net benefit of that action outweighs the economic disadvantage to the
323 taxpayers of that action, then you've satisfied the public purpose doctrine. You've done
324 something that in the end is in the public interest.

325 If on the other hand, if one were to examine a transaction and find that when – one weighs the
326 costs and the benefits, the net effect is a detriment to the public, in that event you would have
327 violated the public purpose doctrine. So, to the extent that you're engaging in these types of
328 transactions in – a view towards economic development, my recommendation would be that you
329 articulate the public purpose, the public benefits that you hope to achieve through your action.
330 By doing that, you established a record of – what the public benefit is and you also educate the
331 public.

332 When the public sees that you're giving away a piece of land for five million dollars or worth five
333 million dollars and they don't clearly understand why – you're doing that, it undermines public
334 confidence in the process, I believe. If you have a legitimate basis for what you're doing, if you
335 truly believe that what you're doing is good for the City, then tell the people of the City of Las
336 Vegas why you're doing it and let them understand the true public purpose that lies behind your
337 action.

338

339 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

340 Thank you. I appreciate that.

341

342 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

343 May I ask a question, please?

344

345 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

346 Yes, Mayor Pro Tem.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

347 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

348 Mr. Chanos, thank you very much for your report. I got a quest – but who; okay, who is the
349 judge and the jury on whether we, on whether it is a plus or a minus on what we do.

350

351 **GEORGE CHANOS**

352 Right. Right.

353

354 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

355 I mean, we have – a lot of people who would see it as, maybe not seeing what we're doing as
356 being a public benefit.

357

358 **GEORGE CHANOS**

359 Absolutely. And –

360

361 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

362 And, you know, when we're sitting up here, we're trying to make that decision. And I see it that
363 we're – gonna bring people in the neighborhood. It's not a dollar and cents – thing. It's
364 something that you – feel that it's in the best interests. And somebody over here (inaudible)
365 going to grief. So – who – is the judge and the jury on this?

366

367 **GEORGE CHANOS**

368 Well, Councilman Reese, the case law surrounding the public purpose doctrine says that you
369 have broad latitude with regard to this. That – you've been elected to make those decisions and
370 that you have broad latitude. So, it's only where your actions are clearly detrimental to the public
371 interest that you violate the public purpose doctrine. So, in the Walters' transaction, our belief is
372 that based on the totality of circumstances, stretching back from the inception of that transaction,
373 through and including the lifting of the deed restriction, that the totality of those circumstances
374 were such that it was a net negative to the public and – that we could prove that case if we
375 needed to. So ultimately, with regard to each case, you have to look on a case-by-case basis and
376 ask yourself in looking at the totality of the circumstances, knowing that you have broad leeway,

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

377 broad latitude to make these decisions, can an overwhelming case be made that you have gone
378 well beyond your discretion and well beyond that latitude and done something that is clearly a net
379 negative to the public. If – that is the case, then – the transaction can be voided, not simply by
380 our office, but any taxpayer has standing to file suit to void such an action.

381

382 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

383 Right. You mentioned it, I wasn't going to, but you know I went out there and I looked at this
384 location, we're talking about Royal Links, and right next door we had Stallion Mountain and the
385 County went through this same – process, I guess, of taking a golf course that had memberships
386 and all this other stuff sold and turning it into housing. And they built the houses within 30 to 40
387 feet of their waste water treatment plant. And this was done and there wasn't any comments
388 made about it. And so when I go out and I look at this, I say to myself, being a, well, maybe not
389 an expert, well what's the difference in putting them here or putting them over here, when they're
390 here, but not here. Then we got an opportunity to put them over here.

391

392 **GEORGE CHANOS**

393 Right.

394

395 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

396 And – to me, it didn't make any difference whether it was a golf course or houses.

397

398 **GEORGE CHANOS**

399 Right.

400

401 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

402 – 'cause they, we got – houses right over here.

403

404 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

405 And I appreciate that, but I'm going to cut, with all due respect, I'm going to cut the discussion
406 off here, because I don't want to get into the particulars of the Royal Links at this time.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

407 **GEORGE CHANOS**

408 I – don't either.

409

410 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

411 The – purpose of what we're trying to do today is to give the – staff direction as to areas that we
412 have to correct.

413

414 **GEORGE CHANOS**

415 Sure.

416

417 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

418 And I – don't want to go into the specifics. That may be for another day.

419

420 **GEORGE CHANOS**

421 Without commenting on those specifics, just generally, the City of Las Vegas is not the only
422 public body that can learn from this report.

423

424 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

425 All right. Well, I – appreciate that, but we're – trying to make ourselves a better – city and I
426 appreciate that. All right. Any other comments? All right. Fine, may I have a motion, please.

427

428 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

429 Yes, Your Honor, **I'd move to accept the report and ask staff if they would certainly take**
430 **into consideration the comments made by the Council members and the Mayor today, as**
431 **well as Mr. Chanos, and see if we can't achieve the goal that this report's gonna give us.**

432

433 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

434 Thank you very much. Let's vote on that, please. Post. Motion carries. **(Motion carried**
435 **unanimously).** Thank you for coming down.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF
October 18, 2006**

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 62a

436 **GEORGE CHANOS**

437 Thank you, Mayor, for your request.

438

439 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

440 And, Mr. Mayor, just thanking Mr. Chanos for the help you're trying to give us so we can be the
441 very best we can be.

442 **(END OF DISCUSSION)**

443 /vwd/ac;slc